UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/936,440	01/25/2002	Uri Mahlab	MAHLAB=2	3860
	7590 10/27/200 D NEIMARK, P.L.L.C	EXAMINER		
624 NINTH ST SUITE 300		BELLO, AGUSTIN		
	N, DC 20001-5303		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/936,440	MAHLAB, URI				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Agustin Bello	2613				
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	n appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address				
THE MA - Extension after SI - If the pe - If NO po - Failure to Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RIALING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication brief of or reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, brief of or reply is specified above, the maximum statutory property within the set or extended period for reply will, by a ly received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may on. a reply within the statutory minimum of the period will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mostatute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communicat ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	tion.			
Status							
1)⊠ R	esponsive to communication(s) filed on	15 July 2009.					
•	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
3)□ S							
c	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositio	n of Claims						
4)⊠ C	laim(s) <u>45-55,57,59,66-73,82-84 and 86</u>	is/are pending in the applica	tion.				
48	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)□ C	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ C							
7) 🗌 C	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)□ C	laim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.					
Applicatio	n Papers						
9) <u></u> ⊤ŀ	ne specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.					
10)□ Tł	ne drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	l accepted or b) objected t	o by the Examiner.				
А	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
R	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)□ Tł	ne oath or declaration is objected to by th	ne Examiner. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a) <u>X</u> 1 2 3	cknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority docur. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been received. ments have been received in priority documents have bee ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s							
	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948		v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date				
3) 🔲 Informa	tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S lo(s)/Mail Date	-/	f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2613

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claim 45-47, 53. 55, 57, 66, 72, 82-83, 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barnsley (U.S. Patent No. 5,488,501).

Regarding claim 45, Barnsley teaches in a telecommunication system, a method for routing optical data signals using a first communication path (the optical path between reference numerals 4 and 6 in Figure 1) comprising at least one optical fiber (i.e. the fiber link between elements 4 and 6 in Figure 1) extending between at least two network elements (reference numerals 4, 6 in Figure 1) of the telecommunication system for carrying optical data signals separated from their associated optical addressing signals, and a second communication path (e.g. the communication path between the output of coupler 7 and the input of optical switch 8 in Figure 1) comprising one or more optical fibers (i.e. the fiber between reference numerals 14 and 8 in Figure 1) extending between at least two network elements of the telecommunication system (reference numerals 14, 8 in Figure 1) for carrying optical addressing signals separated from their associated optical data signals, each of said at least two network elements having routing capabilities (i.e. element 4 routes the optical data signals onto the fiber between elements 4 and 6, while element 6 routes the combined optical data signals and control signal onto fiber 2), the method comprising the steps of providing a combination of said optical addressing signals to

provide addressing information required for establishing an address for routing the optical data signals (column 1 lines 23-31), and providing at least one of said at least one optical fiber (i.e. the fiber link between elements 4 and 6 in Figure 1) comprised in said first communication path for carrying said optical data signals separated from their associated optical addressing signals is different path from any of the one or more optical fibers comprised in said second communication path (i.e. the fiber between reference numerals 14 and 8 in Figure 1), and wherein said optical data signals being conveyed separately from their associated optical addressing signals along said at least one optical fiber were generated at a plurality of different network elements (i.e. the data signals generated at element 4 in Figure 1 where generated by a plurality of different elements, namely a light source and a modulator, each of which are part of the network and are thereby considered network elements; see column 2 lines 5-9), each of said plurality of different network elements having routing capabilities (i.e. the light source routes light towards the modulator and ultimately the fiber between elements 4 and 6, while the modulator within element 4 routes electrical data pulse input from an external data source to be modulated onto the light from the light source).

Regarding claim 46, Barnsley teaches in a telecommunication system, a method for routing optical data signals between at least two routers in the system, which method comprises: generating first optical addressing signals associated with the optical data signals by converting signals identifying a destination address into corresponding optical addressing signals (reference numeral 5a in Figure 1); transmitting said optical addressing signals separated from their associated optical data signals over one or more optical fibers (i.e. the fiber from element 5 and router 6) comprised in a first communication path (i.e. the communication path formed between

elements 5, 6, and 7), said first communication path extending from one (reference numeral 6 in Figure 1) of the at least two routers to another router (reference numeral 7 in Figure 1) of the at least two routers, each of said at least two network elements having routing capabilities (i.e. element 6 routes the optical data signals and control signal onto the fiber 2, while element 7 routes the combined optical data signals and control signal from fiber 2 onto one of two output fibers); and concurrently or subsequently transmitting said optical data signals (reference numeral 4 in Figure 1) separated from their associated optical addressing signals to said another router via a second communication path (i.e. the communication path formed between elements 4, 6, and 7) comprising at least one optical fiber (i.e. the fiber between elements 4 and 6 in Figure 1), said second communication path extending from said one router (reference numeral 6 in Figure 1) of the at least two routers to the another router (reference numeral 7 in Figure 1), and comprising at least one optical fiber (i.e. the fiber between elements 4 and 6 in Figure 1) which is different from any of the at least one optical fibers (i.e. the fiber from element 5 and router 6) comprised in said first communication path, wherein said optical data signals being conveyed separately from their associated optical addressing signals were generated at a plurality of different network elements (i.e. the data signals generated at element 4 in Figure 1 where generated by a plurality of different elements, namely a light source and a modulator, each of which are part of the network and are thereby considered network elements; see column 2 lines 5-9), each of said plurality of different network elements having routing capabilities (i.e. the light source routes light towards the modulator and ultimately the fiber between elements 4 and 6, while the modulator within element 4 routes electrical data pulse input from an external data source to be modulated onto the light from the light source).

Regarding claim 47, Barnsley teaches generating new optical addressing signals (reference numeral 5a in Figure 1) associated with the next section of a transmission path extending from said one router (reference numeral 6 in Figure 1) of the at least two routers towards said destination address; transmitting the new optical addressing signals over one or more optical fibers (i.e. the link comprising reference numerals 2, 5, 6, 7 in Figure 1) extending between said one router of the at least two routers and another router (reference numeral 7 in Figure 1); transmitting said optical data signals to said another router via an optical fiber (i.e. the link comprising reference numerals 2, 4, 6, 7 in Figure 1) extending between said one router of the at least two routers and said another router; wherein said optical fiber over which said optical data signals are transmitted is different form said one or more optical fibers for carrying said optical data signals separated from their associated optical addressing signals, repeating the steps of generating new optical signals (inherent in the transmission of each 16-bit packet and its associated control signal as described in column 3 lines 55 – column 4 line 7), transmitting the new optical addressing signals separated from their associated optical data signals and transmitting said optical data signals separated from their associated new optical addressing signals to said another router (i.e. the addressing signals and the data signals are separated at least before they reach router 6 in Figure 1), until said optical data signals are transmitted to said destination address via subsequent routers (reference numeral 8 in Figure 1) located along a transmission path extending towards said destination address.

Regarding claims 53 and 72, Barnsley teaches that the transmission of at least one of the optical data signals is delayed (as noted in the abstract) until the following steps are performed (column 4 lines 28-34): decoding said optical address signals (column 1 lines 25-27); deriving

addressing information from the decoded optical addressing signals (column 1 lines 25-27); and if required, generating another, or using said, optical routing address for further routing of said optical data signals (column 4 lines 24-29).

Regarding claim 55, Barnsley teaches transmitting to said one of the at least two routers (reference numeral 8 in Figure 1) an indication (i.e. the control signal 5a) that said optical data signals can be forwarded towards their destination; receiving (reference numeral 16 in Figure 1) said indication at said one of the at least two routers; and transmitting, responsive to receiving said indication, said optical data signals towards said another router along said data transmission path (i.e. along to path 11a).

Regarding claim 57, Barnsley teaches that at least one part of said second communication path extends in network different than a network in which said optical data signals are transmitted to their destination (i.e. the next network connected to reference numeral 3 in Figure 1; Figures 5 and 6).

Regarding claim 66, Barnsley teaches a routing apparatus (reference numerals 4, 5, 6, 2 in Figure 1) for routing optical data signals said apparatus comprises means (reference numeral 5 in Figure 1) for generating first optical addressing signals associated with said optical data signals by converting signals identifying a destination address into corresponding optical addressing signals; means (reference numeral 5 in Figure 1) for transmitting said optical addressing signals from said routing apparatus to a second router (reference numeral 7 in Figure 1) over a first communication path (i.e. the path comprised of reference numerals 5, 6, 2, and 7 in Figure 1) comprising at least one optical fiber (i.e. the fiber between reference numeral 5 and 6 in Figure 1) for carrying said optical addressing signals separated from their associated optical

data signals; each of said routing apparatus and said second router having routing capabilities (i.e. elements 6 and 7 route signals to and from the fibers of the system) and means (reference numeral 4 in Figure 1) for transmitting said optical data signals from said routing apparatus to said second router (reference numeral 7 in Figure 1) along a second communication path (i.e. the path comprised of reference numerals 4, 6, 2, and 7 in Figure 1) comprising at least one optical fiber (i.e. the fiber between reference numeral 4 and 6 in Figure 1), said at least one optical fiber for carrying said optical data signals separated from their associated optical addressing signals and wherein said at least one optical fiber for carrying said optical data signals separated from their associated optical addressing signals is different from any of the at least one optical fibers comprised in said first communication path (i.e. the fiber between reference numeral 4 and 6 in Figure 1 is different from the fiber between reference numeral 5 and 6 in Figure 1), and wherein said optical data signals being conveyed separately from their associated optical addressing signals, were generated at a plurality of different network elements (i.e. the data signals generated at element 4 in Figure 1 where generated by a plurality of different elements, namely a light source and a modulator, each of which are part of the network and are thereby considered network elements; see column 2 lines 5-9), each of said plurality of different network elements having routing capabilities (i.e. the light source routes light towards the modulator and ultimately the fiber between elements 4 and 6, while the modulator within element 4 routes electrical data pulse input from an external data source to be modulated onto the light from the light source).

Regarding claim 82, Barnsley teaches an apparatus for transmitting optical data signals between at least two network elements (reference numeral 4 and 12 in Figure 1) in a system a) signal generating means (reference numeral 5 in Figure 1) for generating optical addressing

signals associated with said optical data signals by converting signals identifying a destination address into corresponding optical addressing signals; b) transmission means (reference numeral 5 in Figure 1) for transmitting said optical addressing signals separated from their associated optical data signals over a first communication path (i.e. the path comprised of reference numerals 5, 6, 2, and 7 in Figure 1) comprising one or more optical addressing fibers (i.e. the fiber between reference numeral 5 and 6 in Figure 1) and extending between the at least two network elements towards said destination address, each of said at least two network elements having routing capabilities (i.e. elements 4 routes optical data signals onto the fiber between elements 4 and 6, element 12 routes optical data signal onto the fiber between elements 12 and 13); and c) transmission means (reference numeral 8 in Figure 1) for transmitting said optical data signals towards said destination address (reference numeral 12 in Figure 1) along a second communication path (i.e. the path comprised of reference numerals 4, 6, 2, 7, 8, 13, and 12 in Figure 1) comprising at least one optical fiber extending between the at least two network elements for conveying said optical data signals separated from their associated optical addressing signals fiber (i.e. the fiber between reference numeral 4 and 6 in Figure 1), wherein at least one of said at least one optical fiber in said second communication path is different than any of the at least one optical fibers comprised in the second communication path (i.e. the fiber between reference numeral 4 and 6 in Figure 1 is different from the fiber between reference numeral 5 and 6 in Figure 1), and wherein said optical data signals being conveyed separately from their associated optical addressing signals, were generated at a plurality of different network elements (i.e. the fiber between reference numeral 4 and 6 in Figure 1 is different from the fiber between reference numeral 5 and 6 in Figure 1), and wherein said optical data signals

being conveyed separately from said optical addressing signals, were generated at a plurality of different network elements (i.e. the data signals generated at element 4 in Figure 1 where generated by a plurality of different elements, namely a light source and a modulator, each of which are part of the network and are thereby considered network elements; see column 2 lines 5-9), each of said plurality of different network elements having routing capabilities (i.e. the light source routes light towards the modulator and ultimately the fiber between elements 4 and 6, while the modulator within element 4 routes electrical data pulse input from an external data source to be modulated onto the light from the light source).

Regarding claim 83, Barnsley teaches the apparatus according to Claim 82, further comprising means (reference numeral 8 in Figure 1) for receiving an indication that said optical data signals can be forwarded towards their destination (reference numeral 12 in Figure 1), wherein said means for transmitting said optical data signals (reference numeral 8 in Figure 1) is adapted to transmit the optical data signals towards said destination responsive to receiving said indication (column 4 lines 24-29).

Regarding claim 86, Barnsley teaches a telecommunications routing apparatus (reference numeral 1 in Figure 1) comprising a) receiving means for receiving first optical addressing signals (reference numeral 8 in Figure 1); b) signal generation means for generating second optical addressing signals (reference numeral 21 in Figure 1) associated with the next section of a transmission path (reference numeral 3 in Figure 1) extending towards a destination address; c) transmission means (reference numeral 21 in Figure 1) for transmitting the second optical addressing signals separated (i.e. the separation of addressing and data signals clearly indicated by a branch between elements 20 and 21 in Figure 1) from associated optical data signals

Application/Control Number: 09/936,440

Art Unit: 2613

(reference numeral 20 in Figure 1) over one or more optical fibers (i.e. the fibers at the input and input of element 8 in Figure 1, the fibers connecting element 21 to element 8, the separation of addressing and data signals clearly indicated by a branch between elements 20 and 21, reference numeral 3 in Figure 1) extending from said telecommunication routing apparatus towards the destination address representing a second network element, said telecommunications routing apparatus and said second network element each having routing capabilities (i.e. element 1 in Figure 1 has a plurality of routing capabilities, and a second network element downstream also has routing capabilities in that it routes a received signal to its destination); d) receiving means (reference numeral 8 in Figure 1) for receiving optical data signals generated at a plurality of different network elements each of said plurality of different routing elements having routing capabilities (i.e. the light source of element 4 routes light towards the modulator and ultimately the fiber between elements 4 and 6, while the modulator within element 4 routes electrical data pulse input from an external data source to be modulated onto the light from the light source).; and e) transmission means (reference numeral 8 in Figure 1) for transmitting the optical data signals received towards the destination address along an optical path (reference numeral 20, 9b, 8, 11a, 3 in Figure 1) extending from the telecommunication routing apparatus toward the second network element which comprises at least one optical fiber that is different from any one or more optical fibers over which the second optical addressing signals separated from their associated optical data signals are transmitted (i.e. the separation of addressing and data signals clearly indicated by a branch between elements 20 and 21 in Figure 1).

Page 10

Art Unit: 2613

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 48-52, 54, 59, 67-71, 73, and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnsley in view of Nir (U.S. Patent No. 6,160,652).

Regarding claim 48 and 67, Barnsley differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to specifically teach that information extracted from at least one of the optic addressing signals is transmitted at one of two binary illumination states. However, the transmission of binary information is very well known in the art. Furthermore, Nir, in the same field of optical communication, teaches the transmission of optical address signals in different binary illumination states (column 6 lines 23-65). One skilled in the art would have been motivated to employ a binary illumination scheme such as that taught by Nir in order to increase the number of available addresses. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit optical address signals in different binary illumination states.

Regarding claim 49, Barnsley differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to specifically teach that at least one of the optical addressing signals is transmitted at a certain illumination level whereas at least one other optical addressing signal is presented by absence of illumination. However, as discussed regarding claim 48, Nir teaches the transmission of optical address signals in different binary illumination states and further teaches that the optical addressing signals is transmitted at a certain illumination level (e.g. "1" being high) whereas at

least one other optical addressing signal is presented by absence of illumination (e.g. "0" being low) (column 6 lines 23-65). One skilled in the art would have been motivated to employ a binary illumination scheme such as that taught by Nir in order to increase the number of available addresses. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit optical address signals in different binary illumination states.

Regarding claims 50-52 and 68-71, the combination of references obviates the ability to transmit the optical addressing signals either on the same wavelength, different wavelength, at the same intensity or different intensities (see addressing tables of Nir indicating different intensities and different wavelengths). Furthermore, the applicant's claim to a variety of combinations of wavelengths and intensities indicates that this feature is not critical to the invention at hand. Clearly, one skilled in the art would possess the ability to transmit optical signals at different intensities and wavelengths as desired. As such the combination of references obviates the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 54 and 73, Barnsley differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to specifically teach that the transmission of said at least one of the optical data signals is delayed by allowing said at least one of the optical data signals to pass through an optic fiber of a length corresponding to a desired delay in the transmission. However, Nir teaches this limitation (column 2 line 9 –14). One skilled in the art would have been motivated to employ a delay as taught by Nir in order to prevent loss of data bits (column 5 lines 14-17 of Barnsley). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to delay the transmission of a data signal via a delay fiber.

Art Unit: 2613

Regarding claims 59 and 84, Barnsley differs from the claimed invention in that Barnsley fails to specifically teach that at least one part of said first path extends in a network which uses at least one of the following protocols: MPLS, MP\(\text{NS}\), IP, ATM and SS7. However, Nir teaches the IP protocol (column 1 lines 28-35). Furthermore, the protocols listed by the applicant are very well known in the art and well within the realm of knowledge of one skilled in the art. As such, one skilled in the art could have selected which protocol or combination of protocols would be most effective in the system of Barnsley. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to employ different protocols as taught by Nir in the system of Barnsley.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 06/30/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As noted in the amended office action, the examiner maintains that Barnsley teaches each of the newly added limitations. Furthermore, as noted throughout the prosecution of the case and numerous interviews, the examiner maintains that the optical data signals and the optical addressing signals are carried along separate paths between elements 4, 5, and 6. As to applicant's argument regarding the meaning of the terms "network element," the examiner maintains that elements 4, 5-8, and 14-15 are network elements are elements within the network and can therefore be broadly considered as network elements.

Conclusion

6. This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/936,440. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the

Art Unit: 2613

earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

/Agustin Bello/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2613